FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 1 2 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Ella L. Drollinger Company, CASE NO. CV 13-09537 11 Plaintiff, ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION 12 VS 13 Grace Denton et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly. 17 18 On December 30, 2013, Defendant Gilfert Welton Jackson, having been sued 19 in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice Of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to 20 proceed in forma pauperis. The Court has denied the latter application under separate 21 22 cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court. 23 24 Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that Defendants do not competently allege facts supplying either diversity 25

or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a);

see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S.Ct. 2611, 162

L.Ed.2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship exists, the amount in

26

27

28

controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer complaint recites that the amount in controversy exceeds \$10,000 but does not exceed \$25,000. Nor does Plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, Santa Monica Courthouse, 1725 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90401-3299 for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 1/12/04 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE